

and the results of these manifold collections are embraced in the digest of various readings given by Mr. Alford. This embodies in a condensed form, and by an admirable system of notation, all that can be said on the subject. No essential additions, we believe, can be made to it, unless new manuscripts are brought to light, or a more exhaustive collation of existing ones be performed. Nor should it be forgotten that the existence and character of these various readings are the surest guaranty for the substantial purity of the text.

"St. Paul, in the epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, and Titus, treats upon the relative duties of masters and slaves, but without exhibiting any hostility to the system. In the seventh chapter of first Corinthians, however, he gives utterance to an expression which has long been so rendered as fully to commit the apostle as the open opponent of slavery, and has been often quoted as entirely conclusive upon that point. Before entering into the exegesis of the passage, we will, in elucidation of the position of slavery in the Roman world at the time the epistle was written, lay before the reader an extract from Mr. Bancroft's essay on the 'Decline of the Roman people.'

"The aristocracy owned the soil and its cultivators. The free citizens were poor and degraded. The third class were the class of slaves. It was three times as numerous as the others; though the whole body belonged almost exclusively to the wealthy. Their numbers excited constant apprehension, but care was taken not to distinguish them by a peculiar dress. Their ranks were recruited in various ways.

"The manner in which the laborers on the great plantations were treated, resembled the modern state prison discipline. They were sent out by day to labor in chains, and at night were locked up in cells. Domestic slaves were sent to various workshops, established on purpose to tame the obstinate. Every expedient that human cruelty could devise, was employed to insure industry and docility. The runaway, if re-taken, was branded or crucified, or sold for a gladiator. The slave was valued only as property.

"It does not appear," says the reviewer, "that St. Paul attempted to effect any change in the civil institutions of the world. Had he presented the christian religion as an opponent of those institutions, as hostile to the existing rights of the most influential class of society, and an avowed aggressor upon that class, in the first place, he would have been met at the outset by the whole power of the Roman arm, and no ordinary miracle could have enabled him to have obtained a foothold for the cross; and, in the next place, he would have secured nothing but mutual injury in such a crusade. It is true that his most bitter enemy was the Jew; but the

only attacks upon him that were effective, were made by the Roman authorities. It was from them that the Christians had danger to apprehend. In view of this fact, St. Paul's instructions and commands required from the converts to christianity, the observance of the laws, submission to authorities, the cultivation of peace, and that they should endeavor to have an honest report among those who were not of the faith. Could they have conducted themselves 'honestly towards those without,' would they have obeyed the instructions of the apostle, had they exhibited themselves as disturbers of the existing relations of society, as public disorganizers? St. Paul offered them no such example. The laws as he found them, he conformed to."

You recollect that Onesimus was a converted slave, and a fugitive, and what did St. Paul do? He returned him to his master, thereby not interfering with the existing institutions of the country. If slavery had been so great an evil, so great a crime, he certainly would have left on record something against such an institution. You may search the Bible from beginning to end. You may go back to the Jewish dispensation, and up to the Christian period, and you will not find in the Bible one solitary word which will bear you out in the destruction of slavery, which you are now contending for. Look at the decalogue. I suppose there is no gentleman within the sound of my voice who does not understand, and who has not committed to heart, and perhaps can repeat them better than I can, the Ten Commandments. What is the fourth commandment? That neither your man servant nor your maid servant shall labor on the Sabbath. If slavery did not exist, could there have been man servants and maid servants? Not according to the modern acceptance of the term. It does seem to me that upon that branch of the subject, the authority which I have quoted, in the absence of any other authority to the contrary, is at least equal to what was said on that subject to this Convention.

I believe the most prominent argument which has been used for the destruction of slavery is, that it has been the cause of the war, and that its destruction is necessary to restore the Government. I do not mean to argue that branch of the subject in detail; but have not I as much right to my property in slaves as I have to my property in real estate, or to any other property? The Constitution of the United States, under which this Union was formed, guarantees to me not only the possession but the fruition of that property. If, then, I have the right to hold that property under the Constitution, and if I have not in consequence of holding that property, done anything in derogation of my allegiance to the State, or obedience to the Constitution of the United States in refer-